DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 058 IR 016 979

AUTHOR Curtiss, Deborah

TITLE From Iconic to Lingual: Interpreting Visual

Statements.

PUB DATE [95]

NOTE 7p.; In: Imagery and Visual Literacy: Selected

Readings from the Annual Conference of the International Visual Literacy Association (26th,

International Visual Literacy Association (26th, Tempe, Arizona, October 12-16, 1994); see IR 016

977.

PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Art History; Cognitive Processes; Communication

(Thought Transfer); *Data Interpretation; *Language Acquisition; Psychological Patterns; Visual Learning;

*Visual Literacy; *Visual Perception

IDENTIFIERS *Iconicity; *Visual Communication

ABSTRACT

In this age of proliferating visual communications, there is a permissiveness in subject matter, content, and meaning that is exhilarating, yet overwhelming to interpret in a meaningful or consensual way. By recognizing visual statements, whether a piece of sculpture, an advertisement, a video, or a building, as communication, one can approach their interpretation on different levels and in a number of different ways. The central thesis of this paper is that a visually literate approach to interpreting visual statements must be a flexible, context-relevant, ongoing reinterpretation, and reevaluation. Hence, visual literates have an obligation to explore a variety of perspectives such as art historical, mass communications, perception psychology, semiotics, and hermeneutics. There is a diagram that illustrates the systems for interpretation in communication theory is provided, as well as two lists that outline the various perspectives and categories of an eclectic, inclusive interpretation process. (Contains 35 references.) (DGM)

ate and a set a se



From Iconic to Lingual: Interpreting Visual Statements

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- C This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it...
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quelity
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Deborah Curtiss

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alice Walker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In an age of proliferating visual communication we face a permissiveness in subject matter, content and meaning that is exhilarating, yet overwhelming to interpret in any meaningful or consensual way. By recognizing visual statements—whether a piece of sculpture, an advertisement, a video, or a building-as communication, we can approach their interpretation on different levels and in a number of different ways. In support of my central thesis-that a visually literate approach to interpreting visual statements must be a flexible, context-relevant, ongoing reinterpretation and reevaluation-we, as visual literates, have an obligation to explore a variety of perspectives: art historical, mass communications, perception psychology, semiotics, hermeneutics, etc.

At IVLA '93 I presented a summary of art historical approaches: pre-modern/connois-seurial, modern/structuralist and post-modern/deconstructionist/social.¹ In this, the second of a minimum of three papers that I envision to overview these multiple perspectives, I intended to investigate and summarize how mass communications theorists and perceptual psychologists navigate the transition from the iconic to the lingual to illuminate interpretation of visuals.

Upon undertaking this challenge, however, I bogged down in an overwhelming body of material. What business do I, a visual artist, have in taking the time from my work to become more than cursorily informed? I want interpretation of visuals to be vital, exciting, joyful. Would attempting a synopsis of this vast realm contribute anything, or burden the interpretation process?

While I mulled these questions, I turned to see what people in mass communications have to say about interpretation. Initially, I found little, and most relied upon cognitive psychology. Considering my limited proclivities, cognitive theory threatened to cast more shadow than light on my quest. When I consider that the leap from iconic to lingual has been a central part of my professional life for more than 30 years, the last thing I wanted is for the dynamic process to become engulfed by concepts and theory.

Pressed to have something to offer at the conference, I remembered a presentation at the 1993 International Visual Literacy Symposium on Verbo-Visual Literacy in Delphi, Greece. Professor James Anderson, Chair, Department of Communications at the University of Utah, addressed interpretation in communication theory. The proceedings of the conference were still in production, so I had not seen his paper, but I remembered his quickly dashed on the chalk board diagram. It depicted the historical development of the topic from early theorists to the present.² From a sketch of his sketch, I prepared the diagram which, having passed his review, is reproduced herewith. It schematically represents the development of physical, perceptual, constructionist and hermeneutic theories, and illuminates the complexity of the issues and process. While Anderson makes no distinction for visual rather than verbal communications, I refer the reader to his article for a synopsis of multiple theories.3

Probably no one can arrive at a concise, definitive statement about how we navigate



Thoughts being supervised by a general acceptance of what a thing should be (preconceived notions)

set or material practices

from behind the

eyes to in front

determined subjectivity realm of language Semiotic systems

determinant and

Hermeneutists

Individual as an agent of collective understanding

SISTROPORTHANDO

Ideologues Hegemonists Couflict & resolution (resistance)

interpretation

Polysemic subjective

recognized system of reaction Understanding directed by (prior experience)

Existence

Postmodernist / Poststructurist

Response of audiences

of recognized objects
To semiotic, abstract ♣ From a system

Interpretation in Communication Theory Developed by Professor James A. Anderson Chair, Department of University of Utah

Communications, prepared by D. Curtiss

Physicalists

Perceptionists

Sign as representation Factual

Semiotic Focus: Interpretation: Attribute

Individual:

Invocative Semiotic object

Evocative

Conjunctive

Relationship

Activated Achieved

3

the transition from visual to verbal, a process that can simultaneously feel like a yawning chasm and a dense thicket. Interpretation of visuals and visual experience is, however, an issue that we must address, attempt, and encourage our students and colleagues to think and talk about. As we become knowledgeable about different perspectives, we need not chose one perspective over another, but can achieve a synthesis of multiple approaches that enrich our experience with the visuals we chose to come to know and understand.

Toward that objective, I offer two lists that outline the various perspectives and categories of an eclectic, inclusive interpretation process. In the first, the basic relationships between images and language is indicated.

Perspectives of Interpretation of Visuals

Art history iconic↔lingual pre-modern: connoisseurial/traditional modern: structuralist/formalist post-modern: deconstructionist/ social

Perception psychology a-iconic/lingual identifying, naming, labeling images representation-dependent related to consensual reality phenomenological/theoretical

Communications theory

cognitive psychology iconic↔lingual recognition to understanding cognitive, social content/context semiotics iconic→lingual hermeneutics iconic→lingual explanation, active process

Literary

applications of literary theory/criticism to visuals lingual→iconic

Epistemology

}↔•

Coming to understand the communicative aspects of visuals entails interpreting the content as it is meaningful to the viewer. This requires that the viewer/interpreter recognize the validity of her/his own experience, thinking and views. It can encompass the intent of the creator, if known, but knowledge of that intent cannot be considered essential to the interpretation or interpretation process. Many assume interpretation also implies evaluation, passing a value judgment

on the worth of a visual. This too is only a possible component, not a requirement. Feinstein suggests that evaluation is a *natural* part of the interpretation process, and includes it among categories of interpretation of visuals.

While I have expanded upon Feinstein's categories slightly, I acknowledge her contribution to the following outline.

Categories of Interpretation of Visuals

Description

labeling, a general inventory of what is seen representation-dependent may lead to a literal, consensual reality-grounded interpretation cognitive, factual

Structure

analysis to determine how the image was composed or constructed how the medium and underlying structure support or undermine the strength of the visual

Historical

takes into account influences, context, environment and/or situation

Social/political

relates to contemporary context protest, elucidation, persuasion

Metaphor

subtle, indirect content that may be anagogic, poetic, inspirational, spiritual

Evaluation

how a vist al compares with known or held values, preference/bias, prevailing standards

how it functions in social context, succeeds in achieving identified standards, esthetics.

"Interpretation is an emerging process not an instant. Its activity certainly subsides but need never end." "...images are prone to...distortions from 'reality.'...We extract (and create) meaning from visual stimuli just as we do from text." "We must learn to interpret visual messages in a meaningful way; if passive, we lose control over information which impacts our lives...making meaning is a creative, constructive process."

"Images do not make meanings. Social action changes the way groups experience the world, and therefore, the way they make sense of the world. Social actors make meanings and change meanings. All learners are social actors and the invitations they accept or reject have consequences for themselves and other social actors. What often appears to be a simple 'decoding' of media is really a complex process that involves the acceptance of one set of invitations to construct particular meanings and the rejection of alternatives."8

Inspired by these quotations, I conclude that the interpretation of visuals is a rich and rewarding multilevel process in which one will often arrive somewhere that is impossible to anticipate. Like any journey to an exotic place, the effort is its own reward.

 1 Curtiss, D. (1994) An Eclectic Approach to the Interpretation of Visual Statements. Visual Literacy in the Digital Age, J. Clark-Baca, D. G. Beauchamp & R. A. Braden, eds.

Anderson, J. A. (1994) The Role of Interpretation in Communication Theory. Verbo-Visual Literacy: Understanding and Applying New Educational Communication Media Technologies, Metallinos, N., ed. Concordia University, Montreal.

³ Anderson, op. cit.

⁴Feinstein, H. (1993) Visual Literacy in General Education at the University of Cincinnati. Journal of Visual Literacy 13:2.

⁵ Anderson, op. cit., p. 220.

6 Miller, H. B. and Burton, J. K. (1994). Images and Imagery Theory. In D. M. Moore and F. M. Dwyer (Eds.), Visual Literacy, a Spectrum of Visual Learning, p. 77. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Ocuch, R. A. and Caropresso, E.J. with Miller, H. B. (1994). Making Meaning from Visuals: Creative Thinking and Interpretation of Visual Information. In D. M. Moore and F. M. Dwyer (Eds.), Visual Literacy, a Spectrum of Visual Learning, p. 278. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

8 Ellsworth, E. (1988). Media Interpretation As a Social and Political Act, Journal of Visual Literacy 8:2, p. 36.

Bibliography

- Arnheim, R. (1974) Art and Visual Perception. Berkeley, CA: U. of California
 (1972) Visual Thinking. Bookeley, CA: U. of California.
- Anderson, J. A. (1994) The Role of later pretation in Communication Theory. Vere Visual Literacy: Understanding and Applying New Educational Communication Media Technologies, Metallinos, N., ed. Concordia University, Montreal.
- Barry, A. M. S. (1994). Perceptual Aesthetics and Visual Labguage. In D. M. Moore and F. M. Dwyer (Eds.), Visual Literacy, a Spectrum of Visual Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Berger, A. A. (1984) Signs in Contemporary Culture, an Introduction to Semiotics New York, Longman; Sheffield
- Caputo, J. (1987 Radical Hermeneutics: Repetition, Deconstruction and the Hermeneutic Project) Indiana U.
- Considine, D. M. (1985) The Depiction of Power in the Visual Media: Identifying and Interpreting Images. In L. W. Miller, Creating Meaning. Pomona, CA, California State Polytechnic University.
- Couch, R. A. and Caropresso, E. J. with Miller, H. B. (1994). Making Meaning from Visuals: Creative Thinking and Interpretation of Visual Information. In D. M. Moore and F. M. Dwyer (Eds.), Visual Literacy, a Spectrum of Visual Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Ellsworth, E. (1988). Media Interpretation As a Social and Political Act, *Journal of Visual Literacy* 8:2.
- Feinstein, H. (1993). Visual Literacy in General Education at the University of Cincinnati, Journal of Visual Literacy 13:2.
- Gardner, H. (1984) Art, Mind, & Brain: A
 Cognitive Approach to Creativity N.Y.:
 Basic Books.
- of Multiple Intelligences N.Y.: Basic Books.
- Basic Books. (1993) Multiple Intelligences N.Y.:
- Gibson, J. J. (1966) The Senses Considered as Perceptual Systems. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.



- Gombrich, E. H. (1960) Art and Illusion. Princeton: Princeton U.
- Harmes, J. (1987). Seeing Is: Understanding and Remembering. In R. A. Braden, D. G. Beauchamp & L. W. Miller, Visible & Viable, The Role of Images in Instruction and Communication. Commerce, TX: East Texas State U.
- Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark. (1990) Metaphors we Live By . Chicago: U. of Chicago.
- Lewis, Charles (1991) Images and Ideology: A Theoretical Framework for Critical Research in Visual Literacy, *Journal of Visual Literacy* 11:2.
- Madison, G. B. (1989) The Hermeneutics of Post Modernity Indiana U.
- McNally, Collene and Wolfe, Arnold S. (1991). Deconstructing Images: Understanding the Role of Images in the Social Production of Meaning. In D. G. Beauchamp, J. Clark Baca & R. A. Braden, Investigating Visual Literacy. Blacksburg, VA, International Visual Literacy Association.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964) Primacy of Perception Northwestern U.
- ____ (1964) Sense & Non-Sense (1964) Northwestern U.
- Messaris, Paul. (1994) Visual Literacy: Image, Mind, & Reality. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Metallinos, N. (1994). Physiological and Cognitive Factors in the Study of Visual Images. In D. M. Moore and F. M. Dwyer (Eds.), Visual Literacy, a Spectrum of Visual Lear ing. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

- Miller, H. B. and Burton, J. K. (1994). Images and Imagery Theory. In D. M. Moore and F. M. Dwyer (Eds.), Visual Literacy, a Spectrum of Visual Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NI: Educational Technology Publications.
- Mitchell, W. (1993) The Reconfigured Eye, Visual Truth in the Post Photographic Era Cambridge, MA, MIT.
- Muffoletto, R. (1987). Reading the Visual Text: Dancing to the Music. In R. A. Braden, D. G. Beauchamp & L. W. Miller, Visible & Viable, The Role of Images in Instruction and Communication. Commerce, TX: East Texas State U.
- Pettersson, R. (1988). Interpretation of Image Content. In R. A. Braden, D. G. Beauchamp & L. W. Miller, Visual Literacy in Life and Learning, Blacksburg, VA, Virginia Tech University.
- Saunders, A. C. (1994). Graphics and How
 They Communicate. In D. M. Moore and F.
 M. Dwyer (Eds.), Visual Literacy, a Spectrum of Visual Learning. Englewood Cliffs,
 NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Slatttery, K. (1990). Visual Information in Viewer Interpretation and Evaluation of Television News Stories, *Journal of Visual Literacy* 10:1.
- Stern, R. C. and Robinson, R. S. (1994). Perception and Its Role in Communication and Learning. In D. M. Moore and F. M. Dwyer (Eds.), Visual Literacy, a Spectrum of Visual Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Stredney, Don (1993). Visital Perception in the Arts and Design, Journal of Visual Literacy 13:1.
- Way, E. C. (1991) Knowledge, Representation & Metaphor Kluwer Academic.
 Wisely, F. G. (1994). Communication Models.
 In D. M. Moore and F. M. Dwyer (Eds.), Visual Literacy, a Spectrum of Visual Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.